

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

mf

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/865, 403 05/29/97 ASANO T SONY-P7449

LM02/0628

EXAMINER

PHILIP M SHAW JR  
LIMBACH & LIMBACH  
2001 FERRY BUILDING  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4262

NGUYEN, N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2764

DATE MAILED:

06/28/99

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/865,403	Applicant(s) Asano
Examiner Nga B. Nguyen	Group Art Unit 2764

Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 29, 1997.

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2764

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received on April 5, 1999, which paper has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

### ***Response to Arguments/Amendment***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1, 7-9, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hogan, U.S. Patent No. 5,699,528.

As per claim 1, Hogan discloses a charging system for electronic commerce, which comprises a service provider terminal for providing service to a user via a network in response to

Art Unit: 2764

a request from a user terminal, the system charging a user a fee corresponding to service, comprising:

a charge collection terminal for collection a fee from user, which fee is reflected by service provided by service provider terminal (figure 5, item 503),  
the charge collection terminal existing individually from said service provider terminal (figure 5).

As per claim 7, Hogan discloses the charging system for electronic commerce, wherein: service provider terminal charges a fee to user based on a time period service is provided to the user (column 5, lines 32-33).

As per claim 8, Hogan discloses the charging system for electronic commerce , wherein: service provider terminal charges a fee to user based on contents provided to the user (column 4, lines 1-21).

Claims 9 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 1, therefore the same rejections applied.

Claims 15 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 7, therefore the same rejections applied.

Claims 16 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 8, therefore the same rejections applied.

Art Unit: 2764

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan, U.S. Patent No. 5,699,528 in view of Elgamal, U.S. Patent No. 5,671,279.

As per claim 2, Hogan the charging system for electronic commerce , wherein:

user terminal generates service request data and digital signature data and transmits them via the network to service provider terminal, the service request data is for requesting desired service for the user from service provider terminal and the digital signature data is created based on service request data (column 8, lines 4-23); and

service provider terminal transmits to charge collection terminal service request data and charged fee data, the charged fee data calculated based on service request data (column 33-62).

However, Hogan does not disclose: service provider terminal transmits to charge collection terminal digital signature data. Elgamal discloses service provider terminal transmits to charge collection terminal digital signature data (column 10, lines 32). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hogan's system with transmission digital signature data to charge collection terminal as in Elgamal in order

Art Unit: 2764

to improve the system of Hogan by allowing service provider transmits digital signature to the collection terminal for security purpose.

As per claim 3, Hogan discloses digital signature data is created only by user (column 8, lines 12-14).

As per claim 4, Hogan discloses the charging system for electronic commerce, wherein:  
user terminal generates service request data and digital signature data and transmits them via network to service provider terminal, the service request data is for requesting from service provider terminal desired service for the user and the digital signature data is created based on said service request data (column 8, lines 4-23);

user terminal comprised memory medium which stores service request data (column 4, lines 26-27);

However, Hogan does not disclose: when the user objects to the charge, in response to a fee collection notice from charge collection terminal, the user enables a sending of data stored in memory medium to charge collection terminal, and the charge collection terminal enables the read out service request data and digital signature data from memory medium to confirm the provided desired service. Elgamal discloses: when the user objects to the charge, in response to a fee collection notice from charge collection terminal, the user enables a sending of data stored in memory medium to charge collection terminal, and the charge collection terminal enables the read out service request data and digital signature data from memory medium to confirm the provided desired service (column 14, lines 35-40). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2764

the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hogan's system with the step of sending data stored in memory medium as in Elgamal in order to improve the system of Hogan. Yes, when service provider charges a user a more amount than an amount to charge properly, user can submit request data and digital signature data stored in memory medium to the bank for correcting it.

Claim 5 contains the same limitations as claim 3, therefore the same rejection applied.

Claim 10 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 2, therefore the same rejection applied.

Claim 11 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 3, therefore the same rejection applied.

Claim 12 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 4, therefore the same rejection applied.

Claim 13 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 5, therefore the same rejection applied.

8. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan, U.S. Patent No. 5,699,528 in view of Elgamal, U.S. Patent No. 5,671,279, and further in view of Mizutani et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,823,388.

As per claim 6, Hogan does not disclose service request data stored once in memory medium is impossible to rewrite. Mizutani et al disclose service request data stored once in memory medium is impossible to rewrite (column 2, lines 8-20). It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2764

one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hogan's system with memory medium as in Mizutani et al because it would improve the system of Hogan. The user can store service request data once in memory medium and make it cannot be rewritten in order to ensure the security.

Claim 14 is written in function method and contains the same limitations as claim 6, therefore the same rejection applied.

***Conclusion***

9.     Claims 1-16 are rejected.
10.    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached on (703)305-9768.

11.    **Any response to this action should be mail to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
c/o Technology Center 2700  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Art Unit: 2764

or:

(703) 308-5357 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,  
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.  
VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Nga B. Nguyen  
June 16, 1999

James P. Traximill  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2700

